

APPL. NO. 09/597,430  
AMDT. DATED JULY 22, 2004  
REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF APRIL 22, 2004

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **I. Status Of The Claims**

Claims 1 - 17 were pending in the application.

Claims 1 - 3, 5, 7, and 9 - 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,842 to Baum et al. ("Baum").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Baum.

Claims 4 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **II. Amendments**

Claim 1 is amended to include the recitations previously in claim 4 and claim 6.

Dependent claims 3, 5, and 10-13 are amended to conform to the amendment of independent claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 14-17 are cancelled.

### **III. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-13 Are Allowable**

Claim 1 now includes the limitations previously in claims 4 and 6, which the Examiner indicated were allowable, but for the fact that the claims were written in dependent form and depended from rejected base claims. All claims are now allowable.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the time expended in the telephonic interview of July 20, 2004 with Applicants' attorney, Reginald J. Hill. Per that interview, the claims are amended to include the limitations of claims 4 and 6. Also, Applicant's attorney acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for transmitting a copy of the PTO-892 referenced in the final Office Action, but not received by Applicants' attorney. Notably, this PTO-892 includes, among other things, the acknowledgement that the Examiner considered Dalton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,236,653.

APPL. NO. 09/597,430  
AMOT. DATED JULY 22, 2004  
REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF APRIL 22, 2004

**VI. Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Reginald J. Hill  
Registration No. 39,225  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: July 22, 2004

JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
One IBM Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60611  
(312) 222-9350

1026004v2